

**U.S. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL FOR
ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY AND TECHNOLOGY**

**November 8-9, 2007
Washington, DC**

Meeting Minutes

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Meeting Minutes	
Thursday, November 8, 2007	
Welcome and Introductions	3
Opening Remarks from EPA's Deputy Administrator	3
Review and Approval of Draft NACEPT Environmental Stewardship Report.....	7
Review and Approval of Draft NACEPT Energy Advice Letter #3	10
Discussion of Draft NACEPT Comments on EPA's 2007 Report on the Environment	13
Potential Projects for NACEPT	16
Friday, November 9, 2007	
Discussion of NACEPT Report Process	19
Workgroup Report-Outs	21
Energy and Environment Workgroup	21
Sustainable Water Infrastructure Workgroup	22
Environmental Stewardship/Cooperative Conservation Workgroup.....	22
Update on the 20 th Anniversary of NACEPT	24
Wrap Up and Next Steps.....	26
Attachment 1: List of Participants	

**U.S. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL FOR
ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY AND TECHNOLOGY
November 8-9, 2007
Washington, DC**

Meeting Minutes

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) convened a meeting of the National Advisory Council for Environmental Policy and Technology (NACEPT). The proceedings were held at The Mandarin Oriental Hotel on November 8-9, 2007 in Washington, DC.

Thursday, November 8, 2007

Welcome and Introductions

Mr. Howard called the meeting to order and announced that he was asked by EPA Administrator Stephen Johnson to continue serving as the NACEPT Chair for another year and has agreed. Mr. Howard also thanked the workgroups and EPA staff for their efforts. Participants then introduced themselves.

Ms. O'Donnell requested a discussion about NACEPT's work models. Mr. Howard replied that lengthy reports have a better system, but projects with a quicker turnaround are more difficult.

Mr. Howard then introduced EPA Deputy Administrator, Marcus Peacock, and recommended his Flow of the River blog which gives insight into what the EPA is doing regarding rulemaking, management, performance metrics, and regional activities.

Opening Remarks from EPA's Deputy Administrator

Mr. Peacock welcomed the NACEPT members and thanked them for their dedication. He recognized John Howard as the NACEPT Chair and the Workgroup Chairs for their special role. He noted that one of the important roles of federal advisory committees, particularly the Council, is to look ahead and stay ahead of the conditions - - not as they change, but before they change.

Mr. Peacock discussed the impact of several reports issued by NACEPT in the past year, including the second Environmental Technology Report, a second advice letter on biofuels, and its Initial Findings and Recommendations regarding the Sustainable Infrastructure Watershed Pillar. Going forward, the Council will be providing a report on Environmental Stewardship and Cooperative Conservation, another advice letter on biofuels, and comments on the 2007 Report on the Environment: Highlights of National Trends.

Energy and the Environment - Dr. George Gray, Assistant Administrator for Research and Development and Science Advisor to the Administrator, was appointed to serve on the federal interagency Biomass Research and Development Board which meets monthly. Dr. Gray, Bob Meyers, Acting Assistant Administrator for the Office of Air and Radiation, Agricultural Advisor Jon Scholl, and Region 7 Administrator John Askew were asked to convene an agency-wide group to develop an internal EPA biofuels strategy. The development of this strategy will be closely coordinated with the national biofuels plan being formulated by the Biomass R&D Board. As suggested by NACEPT, EPA is adopting the biofuels supply chain framework and doing an inventory of EPA-related activities. Last week, Dr. Gray asked all regional and program offices to designate participants to work with the Office of Research and Development to develop the scope and content of the EPA biofuels strategy by early next year.

Environmental Technology - Two major actions have emerged from NACEPT's advice on environmental technology. First, is the establishment of a Senior Environmental Technology Officer, or SETO, in the Office of the Science Advisor. The SETO's responsibilities will include providing direct advice to the Administrator, promoting and managing an innovative environmental technology infrastructure, and establishing partnerships inside and outside the Agency to bring environmental technologies to the Agency and the market faster. Second, all EPA regional offices have appointed a regional technology advocate. The first meeting is in Chicago, December 3-5, to discuss their responsibilities and to establish a regional technology network.

The Office of Research and Development has also developed an environmental problem identification questionnaire to identify high-priority issues where technology can help characterize and/or solve the problem. In addition, EPA has created an environmental technology verification assessment staff within the Office of Research and Development's National Risk Management and Research Laboratory. That staff will provide enhanced technology support to the SETO and the Agency including technology verification and state-of-the-art assessments.

Sustainable Water Infrastructure - A number of the Council's recommendations focused on improving EPA's outreach efforts to stakeholder groups who can affect infrastructure decisions. The Office of Water is going to provide a formal response to NACEPT's recommendations in the near future.

NACEPT 20th Anniversary - There are currently 27 federal advisory committees in the EPA. Mr. Peacock has been meeting with Rafael DeLeon and his management team about how to better use advisory committees, including how to ensure the committees get clear charges from EPA and feedback on how recommendations are being acted on. An evaluation done on NACEPT's 10-year study concluded NACEPT had a significant impact on the Agency's programs and decision-making. He recommends doing the same for the 20th Anniversary.

Future Agenda - Over the next two years, NACEPT may be asked to address EPA's information access strategy, partnership programs and international work to assist the Agency in meeting its mission of protecting human health and environment.

Mr. Peacock thanked NACEPT for its significant work over the past two years.

Q & A - Ms. O'Donnell suggested a collaborative opportunity for EPA's technology programs with state efforts such as the technology reciprocity partnership under ECOS. Mr. Peacock replied that EPA is still putting in place the people needed in the network, and the SETO position hasn't been filled yet. The regions dealing with the states may drive it. In 6 months to a year, progress in this area will be evaluated.

Ms. O'Donnell also asked if he would like the Council's ideas on looking ahead/future topics. He mentioned climate change as a possible issue for federal advisory committees.

Ms. Green asked what kind of success EPA has had in finding a workforce that reflects the complex nature of the environmental issues the Agency is facing. Mr. Peacock replied that for the past year, both headquarters and regions have aggressively reached out to minority learning institutions. The idea is to bring more diversity into the Agency. It will take some time to see the response to this effort. Mr. Peacock stated there is now a Quarterly Management Report on the internet. One thing it does is track the diversity of the Agency's work force. The quality of decision-making becomes better when you have different experiences and backgrounds.

Mr. Peacock stated that the EPA needs to identify the skills and institutional knowledge that will be lost over the next few years and identify how to fill those gaps. The younger people in the Agency have a new way of thinking; the idea of going out and working in a different way on environmental problems is second nature to them. They are the people who should be directed into the senior executive slots. Every other federal and state agency, as well as the private sector, are facing the same issue and are competing for these same young people. The federal government has to hire 167,000 people in the next five years in the Washington area. It's one of the most competitive areas, particularly for technical people.

Mr. Struhs asked if the 27 EPA federal advisory committees or councils focus on human resources and planning for the future. It was noted that most of the committees are science related. The EPA should form a commission to get perspective from the states and industry to think about the future of the human resource issue. Industry does a much better job with succession planning. If the EPA waits for those 50% of the SES employees to retire and then begins the process of replacing them, it's already too late. The Agency should identify today who will be replacing the retirees in 2-3 years.

Mr. Peacock stated that EPA has an internal Human Resources Council, but an external view would be terrific. He stated that NACEPT could consider the issue under its broad charter.

Dr. Watts stated that there is an extreme shortage of human resources in the environmental industry as a whole in New Jersey, which may be representative of the rest of the country. The broader issue is how to encourage high school and college students to think about the environment as a career. There are things universities can do, but there are probably things EPA can do, too. A group looking at that issue may be important.

Mr. Peacock agreed and further stated there was a lot of talk about recruitment at the Cincinnati meeting. Region 1 put together a great video targeted to students coming out of college; the Agency is going to try to get it on YouTube. One advantage the Agency has is that its mission is clear and good.

Dr. Smith added that the Council of Environmental Deans and Directors, under the auspices of the National Council of Science and the Environment, has about 160 universities and colleges at the dean and director level in the environmental arena. The Agency should become increasingly active in that group because it provides a forum.

Dr. Watts stated that the 2007 Report on the Environment is getting a lot of interesting commentary both from NACEPT and the Science Advisory Board. To move to a model of environmental stewardship, which will include voluntary actions on the part of individuals as well as groups, they're going to need information about what's happening with the environment and what we as individuals or groups can do. The Report on the Environment is one of the most important tools the EPA has to motivate environmental stewardship.

Mr. Peacock stated that The Quarterly Management Report has very few trends in it due to the short time periods it covers. So, the Report on the Environment is an important part of showing what's happening.

Ms. Green asked to what extent the Council could help the Agency better quantify the value of its voluntary programs.

Mr. Peacock stated that EPA asked the National Academy of Sciences to take a look at the science programs and identify what's at the cutting edge of efficiency measures for science programs. There are limitations in how the Agency can measure the success of partnership programs. In some quarters there has been a concerted attack on voluntary programs, which is unfair. In order to find out how well EPA is doing in some of the partnership programs, the Agency should go out and ask questions of partners and get information from them. There are people at OMB who think the EPA shouldn't be doing the surveys, but that is the only way to get the information.

Ms. Green mentioned one voluntary partnership she's aware of where EPA is asking different questions than its partners are interested in. This creates a disconnect and people are asking why are we in this partnership? EPA needs to recognize those dynamics.

Mr. Peacock answered that this is another reason outside advice is helpful. Charles Ingebretson and Rick Otis are working on developing an appropriate charge for NACEPT on this particular issue.

Review and Approval of Draft NACEPT Report - - *EVERYONE’S BUSINESS: Working Towards Sustainability Through Environmental Stewardship and Collaboration*

Mr. Meyers noted that the Council members have a copy of the workgroup’s draft report, *Everyone’s Business: Working towards Sustainability through Environmental Stewardship and Collaboration*. Mr. Meyers thanked the workgroup members: Bob Gruenig, Joel Bolstein, John Wise, Frank Stewart, Jennifer Nash, Paul Anastas, Stan Laskowski, Melanie Worley, Cindy Angelelli, Dee Allen, and Dan Williams. He also thanked EPA staff: Derry Allen, Pat Bonner, Sonia Altieri, Jay Benforado and Stan Meiburg.

Mr. Meyers stated that the title, Everyday Choices means that it’s everyone’s business. There’s an 11-page executive summary in the front with key findings and recommendations. Stewardship is an ethic and practice of shared responsibility for environmental protection. Sustainability is a characteristic of living systems that embody the possibility of flourishing forever. We’ve simplified it to refer to collaborative governance, which is a way of acting in which each party shares responsibility for deciding the means by which policy goals will be achieved. The ethic and practice of stewardship can be realized only if EPA works collaboratively with others.

The key recommendations of the report are:

- 1) EPA should reframe its mission, with stewardship as a unifying theme and ethic;
- 2) EPA should strive to become the world’s premier stewardship model and catalyst by integrating regulatory programs, grants, voluntary partnerships, information, in-house operations and other tools into a common framework;
- 3) EPA should foster stewardship by providing leadership and collaborative governance and participating in partnerships organized by others;
- 4) EPA should systematically invest in the skills and competencies necessary for the Agency’s domestic and global leadership in environmental stewardship;
- 5) EPA should drive the ethic and practice of stewardship deep into the culture of the Agency.

Stewardship is clearly the way EPA needs to steer its ship. Sustainability and good business practices are stewardship issues. No one should be left out of the zone of responsibility.

Mr. Bolstein stated that the workgroup is seeking constructive comments on this report.

Mr. Wise commented that this is a major recommendation to reframe the mission of the Agency. The report also has over 20 immediate action steps. Within a year, the administration and senior Agency leadership is going to change. We want to start the process so the new administration will find a package of recommendations they can immediately implement.

Ms. Green asked if the workgroup considered recommending that EPA become ISO 14001 certified? Agencies ask companies to do that, and our administration needs to support the people in the field who are doing it. The exercise of EPA getting that certification could move the whole debate forward.

Mr. Meyers replied that most of the EPA labs are 14001 certified.

Ms. Green pointed out that it's different when headquarters does it; you are then talking about support infrastructure that enables facilities in those regions to do their job.

Mr. Meyers said the workgroup would be happy to take up a specific recommendation that considers ISO 14001 certification for headquarters.

Mr. Struhs stated that the report does a nice job of clarifying sustainability versus stewardship. It also does a good job of advancing the idea that voluntary programs and stewardship projects can no longer be viewed as annexes to the Agency, but has to become the core of what the Agency is about. The report doesn't go far enough in addressing what is going to be required in terms of human resources and changes in the Agency. We need to speak more directly to the fact that some EPA employees will embrace this new way of thinking, but some won't. We should say something to the effect that those employees who demonstrate the ability to execute partnerships and have a command of partnering skills should be promoted. Those who don't should be released, or at least not promoted.

Ms. Green commented that one way to do it is to make it a core competency.

Mr. Meyers agreed they were struggling in the HR area. They will take up Mr. Struhs' suggestion in their afternoon work session. It's a very good point.

Ms. Goss pointed out the report focuses on getting senior management to embrace this concept, but keep in mind the regulated sector is usually dealing with EPA staff and it's important that they embrace the issue. It has to filter all the way through EPA, not just one level.

Mr. Olson said the recommendation to reframe the Agency mission around stewardship is one of the most important to ever come out of the NACEPT Council. It's on the order of the Agency's shift from pollution control to pollution prevention, perhaps even bolder.

Ms. O'Donnell recommended pulling out the top three to five of the 21 recommendations and putting them in front of the executive summary to strengthen the message. Some

were less actionable than others, but some would jumpstart this whole thing by sending an immediate message of what direction this administration is going in.

Mr. Crane has not read the report in detail, but sees a disconnect between the EPA and state governments and getting the message down to individual organizations at the grassroots level. He works primarily at the local level and a mechanism needs to be found to filter this message to the local levels.

Mr. Meyers stated that the complexity and extent of issues these days don't lend themselves to a top-down approach. NEPA Section 101, as well as language in the Clean Water Act, give EPA the ability to move laterally. It's doing some of that, but it is not thinking how to connect all the dots and pull together all the institutions and individuals who need to be involved. The report is saying that there needs to be a new way of acting. Mr. Crane said the report is well-written, and he will use a lot of it in his work to get the information out.

Mr. Bolstein points out the Change the World campaign had three staff people assigned to it who gathered thousands of retail and community groups around the country. What they achieved is incredible, convincing the public all around the country to change their light bulbs. It shows the possibilities when things filter down to the local level. It's a prime example of stewardship, getting people to want to change their behavior.

Dr. Watts says the report responds commendably to the charge. Looking at this as both a policy and a political issue, there are whole groups of people, both within and outside the Agency, who are vested in how things are done at the moment. Dr. Watts thinks talking about changing the mission of the agency is wonderful, but there is going to be significant resistance. Some comment to that effect in the advice or transmittal letter might be appropriate. There may be an advantage to talking about how the successful implementation of this new approach can be measured. To talk about mission change without realizing it's going to be hard to do probably doesn't tell the whole story.

Mr. Struhs points out that a probable criticism of recommending the path of stewardship and volunteer programs is that it prompts people to ask what the legal authority is to do it. But this report handles it well by going back to the roots of NEPA as the legal authority. You might want to highlight that in the transmittal letter for those who will ask under what authority are these changes recommended.

Mr. Meyers replies that the interim letter to the administrator did cite the pertinent sections of NEPA. But it's a good idea to surface it again in the transmittal letter.

Mr. Neukrug is very excited to be part of a group putting out a report like this. It's the best thing we could possibly be saying to EPA about environmental issues. He also thinks the reconnect with NEPA is incredibly important because this report is asking EPA to move back from the program priorities it's doing now to the priorities based upon the environment and public health, which is the original NEPA charge. So, the report should

clearly point out it's not asking the EPA to create a new mission, it's asking them to return to their original mission.

Mr. Meyers says the workgroup has taken notes on the comments today and will go over some final changes this afternoon for the final report and transmittal letter. Meyers asks for approval of the Council for the report. With the provision that the comments made today are added, approval is given for the report.

Mr. Howard asks for a revised draft tomorrow of the cover letter.

Review and Approval of Draft NACEPT Energy and Environment Advice Letter #3

Mr. Olson stated that the workgroup members are: Frank Stewart, Carolyn Green, Bill Holmberg, Scott Sklar, Vicki Tschinkel, David Struhs, Brenda Groskinsky, Cindy Riley, Donna Perla and Bob Larson. The bottom line of the charge was to provide advice about what EPA can do to contribute to the accelerated effort to develop biofuels in a sustainable way. Rather than take the time for a report, they felt the most effective approach was to do a series of advice letters.

The Interagency Biomass R&D Board has emerged as the most important coordinating body of the intergovernmental effort. By legislative mandate it was supposed to consist of members who were all high-level political appointees from their agency. In the first advice letter, we recommended appointing a high level person to the Board. There are more issues to deal with beyond the Office of Air and Radiation (OAR), where most of these responsibilities were legislatively set. There are water and land use issues. We argued that the agency should develop a strategy going beyond what it was required to do. The results of the advice letter were fast; the Administrator appointed George Gray to the Interagency Biomass R&D Board where he's already begun to play an active role. And, Dr. Gray has asked all assistant and regional administrators to develop a cross-agency dialogue on biofuels.

In the second advice letter, we addressed the problem that everyone tends to look at biofuel issues through their own organizational chart. We recommended a framework based on the biofuels supply chain for the whole agency to adopt as a common approach to biofuels. We also recommended George Gray bring this before the Interagency R&D Board and get the entire federal government working out of this common framework; this has happened.

The third letter goes into more detail about strategies the Agency might use to move this effort forward. The letter cited the Subcommittee on Environmental Technology and the whole list of strategies they proposed for moving technologies along such as state grants, R&D programs, ORD's Small Business Innovation and Research grants, the STAR Program, and the environmental technology verification program. These are all programs to be brought to bear to move things along. When businesses apply for approval of their plants, give them information as to what's been problematic and learn from the successes.

We asked the Agency to explore the possibility for allowing higher ethanol blends. Right now most gasoline has a 10% ethanol blend. It's the EPA's responsibility to make sure higher blends are technically and environmentally appropriate. We asked the Agency to bring together a group that looks into appropriate economic analysis or cross-benefit analysis to help others make good decisions. We asked the Agency to look at strategic planning and human resources. The workload on biofuels has become enormous; it's important to make sure the resources are there so you're not burning people out.

The fourth and perhaps last advice letter would be about creating an operational framework for sustainability. That's what the energy workgroup will talk about at this meeting.

The Chevy Volt will be a plug-in hybrid that will get over 100 mpg.; it's in the production pipeline and will happen in a few years. Imagine it uses an E-85 blend, meaning for every one part of gasoline, there's four parts biofuels. That means a car with gasoline consumption of 400-500 mpg. That puts a real dent on dependence on foreign oil, national security, CO2 emissions and air quality. Helping this federal initiative move forward in a sustainable way is really important.

Mr. Stewart added that the committee has hopefully made some suggestions that can lead the Agency to start walking the talk and get in the game. Now we want to talk about the game plan involved in that. There should be research to understand the impacts of the expanding biomass-biofuels production on sustainability in the industry. People on the outside need information from a credible source they can base their judgments on, provide economic underpinning for decision-making. Lastly, understand this is going to be an enormous task.

Mr. Gruenig requests that tribal land data be included. He asks if the recommended EPA actions will use existing tools, or expand resources to do this. He'd also like to see tribal grants listed along with state grants.

Mr. Stewart stated that the workgroup is concerned that the Agency hasn't fully dealt with the resources needed to undertake this task, not only in terms of dollars but also the number of people and agencies involved. We're suggesting the Agency take a new look at what it's going to take to do it.

Ms. O'Donnell says it's important to elaborate on the 20 in 10 goal (20% reduction in gasoline consumption in ten years). It would also be useful for EPA to do a projection beyond 10 years and also be able to look at what the benefits will be in terms of greenhouse gas reduction. And what are some of the issues for water consumption and air quality. It would help the report to be as quantifiable as possible.

Mr. Stewart stated that the group is concerned about the possibility of serious negative impacts. We are suggesting the Agency be prepared to monitor very carefully as we proceed. If there are significant impacts on the aquifers, application of fertilizers, emissions related to processing, we need to be prepared to boldly step up. If the way we

are going about it is not sustainable, positive and responsible, we need to either stop or find another way of doing business.

Mr. Olson stated that one of our more detailed recommendations was to use ORD's MARKAL model to do those kinds of projections.

Ms. Perla stated that OAR is in the process of developing the proposed alternative fuel standard right now. The Agency is very much embroiled in a lifecycle assessment on certain parts of the biofuels production supply chain. It's by no means totally comprehensive, and the data we have available to use is not fully evolved. The Agency has talked about the fact that once the rule goes out for proposal, we'll hear back from the public on where they think some of the vulnerabilities are.

Dr. Smith stated that the Powerpoint slide of 500 miles a gallon is very interesting. There's never been such a time to grab the public's enthusiasm, imagination and leadership. 500 miles per gallon of gasoline will fundamentally change the world. If the Agency could partner with GM or others in setting that as a goal in ten years, it would be tantamount to landing a man on the moon.

Mr. Bolstein suggested making sure we move the corn the shortest distance possible to get it to the ethanol plant. Also, can anything be said about locating some of these facilities on brownfield sites as opposed to greenfields? We should also think about making sure there isn't any group of communities that end up becoming the ethanol production areas of the country.

Dr. Watts supports the advice letter. Even though NACEPT in the last several months has been doing a lot of things, the individual actions are being connected, and each independent action is important because they inform the other things the Council is doing.

Mr. Olson stated that in the last teleconference we were actually talking about the desirability of getting together with the members of the stewardship group and really developing that line of thought further.

Mr. Howard stated that it's important to keep in mind that although you're in one workgroup, there's a lot going on in other groups, and you can just ask what the others are doing because it's our job to knit all this stuff together when we give comprehensive advice to the EPA.

Ms. Green added that while it's important to talk about sufficient staff and monetary resources directed toward the biofuels initiative, we also need to acknowledge it's going to put EPA in some very difficult regulatory and legal dilemmas, because as soon as they take staff away from some of their traditional mandated programs, they get sued. And at the same time, they're not being given additional resources. While analyzing the sustainability and development of the biofuels industry, we have to understand the impact on existing facilities and existing oil industry. We're talking about getting rid of an

industry; how does that happen? How do we make sure we're not setting somebody up with huge capital costs and then saying, well, never mind, we're going to do something else, which is the way the whole regulatory program seems to be going.

Mr. Stewart stated that it's important for the Agency to understand and be actively engaged in making clear that the biofuels and petroleum industries are interconnected. The traditional industry is making very heavy investments that may not in the long-term be consistent with where the policy seems to be going.

Mr. Olson said the letter could be more explicit.

Ms. Riley stated that one of the benefits of stepping back and looking at the supply chain is saying, collectively, what does everybody have to do to make that a reality?

Mr. Stewart said that the objective is to present this draft and get the Council's recommendations on how and to what extent we go forward with it. Mr. Howard recommended incorporating the comments raised this morning and going forward with the draft, and the Council agreed.

Discussion of Draft NACEPT Comments on *EPA's 2007 Report on the Environment: Highlights of National Trends*

Ms. O'Donnell said the workgroup is working in concert with the Science Advisory Board (SAB); we hope to have a final report in a month. Our charge is to do a peer review of EPA's Report on the Environment, the last one of which was done in 2003. The purpose of the Report on the Environment is to communicate to the educated citizen what the status of our environment is in this country, to be able to say how we're doing in terms of air, water, land, ecosystems and human health. Part of the task is to review the highlights document only. The two SAB members working with us are George Lambert and Bob Twiss. There are three questions we were supposed to answer: 1) Does the Highlights Document accurately reflect the scientific content of the Technical Document?; 2) Does the Highlights Document scientifically and accurately reflect what's in the Technical Document and can you draw some conclusions from the Highlights Document?; and 3) Is it really understandable to the target audience?

It was difficult to draw conclusions from the report because there was an absence of conclusions and cause and effect relationships. We think there should be a Conclusions section at the end of each chapter, or else at the end of the document.

Our second recommendation focuses on the issue of sustainability, voluntary partnerships and people doing the right thing. There was very little in terms of what the public can do. Perhaps a link to say, if you're interested in what you can do, go to this link on the EPA website. There could also be a sign-up – I want to receive e-mails on what I can do to help.

Our third issue was relevance. A lot of the national data is necessarily general and people are going to ask how it compares to where they live. One way to address that is to add

success stories; here's what happened on the Rouge River Watershed, or here's a model air-quality program from Dallas.

There are issues that were not mentioned in the Highlight Document that are in the forefront of people's minds; things like childhood obesity wasn't mentioned under Human Health. The way we do transportation and land use, how we've become a sedentary society has a lot of environmental and land-use implications. This was not mentioned and is a huge issue. Asthma was not highlighted as an issue related to air quality; autism was not addressed. These things are in the paper every day and the Report on the Environment needs to mention possible environmental relationships, even if not scientifically locked down.

We discussed how to make it available: electronically, hard copy? Can people comment on it? Is it going to be a work in progress so it can be updated? How can we take full advantage of our electronic society? There should be a theme EPA pulls out that ties the chapters together; we tried to pull out a sustainability theme for each chapter. The ratio between land consumption and population is three to one. So, we're sprawling at a rate three times population growth. This jumped out at everyone to say we're not growing in a sustainable way.

Dr. Watts stated that the Highlights Document is 40 pages; the Science Report is 500+ pages. He invited George Lambert to address the relationship between the Science Report and the Highlights Document.

Dr. Lambert stated that the workgroup found good correlation between the Technical Document and the Highlights Document, but a significant problem lies in that the SAB feels there are some inadequacies in the Technical Document and has made recommendations to improve the document before final publication. There should be better integration and discussion of the indicators; the final report should contain a synthesis chapter that fully integrates the entire report and discusses health and ecosystem status and trends; there are concerns about statistics, uncertainties were not adequately discussed, and most of the document had no real conclusions. There's also no discussion of status and trends and no looking back at documents.

The Report on the Environment should not be seen as a public relations tool, or a document to make the EPA look good. The report needs to show where progress is being made as well as not being made. Also, the set of indicators must be stable so that if you're looking for trends you're comparing the same kinds of things time after time. You can't have a dramatic change of indicators every three years. The Report on the Environment should be separate from the regulatory and performance evaluation reporting activities of EPA. Local and regional information is important; for people to engage in stewardship, they need to know what's happening close to home as well as at a national level. Make sure the indicators reflect important environmental conditions. The electronic edition should be easy to use but also easy to change. It has to be an active and dynamic set of data.

Dr. Lambert stated that although the document says general public the target audience is really policy advisors and decision makers. He questions whether the document would be useful to those groups.

Dr. Watts stated that next steps will be based on the response from the Council members. He welcomed any suggestions and stated that the document will be refined and sent to the Council for review. A teleconference call with the full Council will be scheduled in the near future.

Ms. Altieri stated the staff will make sure the workgroup members are comfortable with the refined version before scheduling a full Council teleconference.

Ms. Goss asked why wastewater isn't included in the Report on the Environment. In the industry we hear nothing but doom and gloom; yet in this report you'd think we were doing well because nothing in here addresses it. There are two references to sewage overflows and one to direct discharge, but nothing giving the impression it's as bad as what we sometimes hear. I'd like feedback as to why that subject was left out. I'd like some feedback as to how the wastewater business is doing as a whole. There is mixed feedback.

Mr. Meyers asked if EPA is making an affirmative effort to improve the quality of data coming in from other agencies?

Dr. Lambert stated that there is an interagency working group trying to homogenize the data. For example, there are nine agencies that each have a different definition of a forest, so when EPA tries to put together data from these agencies, it can't. So there's a group headed by EPA and the White House to get the agencies looking at single parameters. Absence of discussion of wastewater management is highlighted as a major flaw of the ROE.

Mr. Struhs asked how this relates to other environmental reports both the government and the private sector produces.

Dr. Watts answered that this particular initiative emerged at EPA when Administrator Whitman asked, what data is available to tell if EPA is doing good work. The answer was that the data that was available wasn't in the right kind of context to answer those questions, so that started this initiative. We need to ask why we're doing this if it's the same as other activities. If it isn't, we need to identify how it's different.

Mr. Olson added that it was frustrating going through the report and seeing section after section say that there's not adequate data, particularly in the Technical Document. But a valuable contribution may be to lay it all out in one space: here's the data collection agenda we see as necessary.

Potential Projects for NACEPT

EPA's Information Access Strategy

Mr. Flynn, Director, Office of Information Analysis and Access, EPA's Office of Environmental Information (OEI), stated that his office looks at how EPA provides access to information. We would like to have NACEPT work with us to look at how EPA provides access to environmental information. We know we can do better in the technology side and with packaging. We want a dialogue as to how we're doing with our electronic presentations, our web site, generally how we present information and from there provide a strategy going forward. How do we use the social technology that young people use? How do we operate in partnership with others? EPA going forward needs to focus and structure our resources to better provide access.

Mr. Flynn added that there is a plan to have a dialogue process that would focus on key questions to get the customers' input. We'd do it internally in EPA because a big part of our mission is providing information to our scientists and others within EPA. We want on-line as well as face-to-face dialogue. These would be targeted efforts over the next six to nine months. Who is the customer, what are people looking for, how do they want it, and what is our role in that? In January 2008, we'll seek input to the questions just laid out. Then over the next six months we'll work towards a draft document focusing on policy and strategic direction issues related to technology and how we would deliver information. We aim to have a final report by the end of the calendar year. Quality of the information is also a key part and we want input about where we are with that.

Mr. Struhs stated that it's unlikely government will ever catch up and be the cutting edge of how to move data around. But what the government can do with more credibility than anyone else is ensure the quality and integrity of the information.

Mr. Meyers stated that one of the valuable things EPA does in its information work is create the gold standard. That should be the goal here: is your information the gold standard which others can be measured against? The spaghetti chart in the presentation has arrows going out, but none coming back in. In thinking about information access, there needs to be a feedback loop. There's a lot of information out there and a very useful EPA function is helping sort through it.

Mr. Flynn pointed out that the chart hasn't been peer reviewed yet.

Mr. Meyers said that EPA projects itself as part of the web of relationships, but not necessarily always the spider in the center of the web that controls everything.

Mr. Struhs stated that the vast majority of information EPA collects and provides comes from two sources: the states and the regulated entities. So, the arrows should go both ways and should be included.

Mr. DeLeon stated that in terms of outreach, OEI should pay particular attention to native and people of color communities in terms of information needs, and how do they access that information. When I saw the term on your presentation, digital natives, I thought of digital divide. Sometimes people want to see you acknowledge them as a concern even if you can't address it.

Mr. Flynn replied that the term 'digital natives' refers to younger generations for whom the digital world is second nature; it's their world.

Ms. Green added that at some point you have to deal with how the Agency's documents are crafted. When I go on the EPA website, what I get are print documents that have been put on the website. When you're thinking digitally, it informs how those documents themselves are crafted. How you structure a document in print is very different from how that document is accessed on the web.

Mr. Flynn agreed. We have built an electronic presentation of our information based partly on how EPA is structured and pumps out products. You can link to a report, but the world doesn't operate around reports; it operates around environmental problems or issues. This is about thinking how we organize information and data so it can be usable to the customers. We're grappling with how to break down a 500-page report into an electronic presentation where people can pull the indicator data without losing the context of the discussion.

Dr. Cruse added that another group to cooperate with would be the state extension services, which takes a more active role in terms of targeting people that may have specific needs for the information you have. Extension services are not limited to agriculture; environment is a key component of what they do these days.

Mr. Olson suggested the Agency be ambitious in thinking about what may be possible a decade ahead, even if the first steps have to be modest. Bring in some people from Google and Microsoft, people at the leading edge of information presentation to brainstorm about what's emerging and what can be done.

Mr. Flynn stated that the agency had ongoing discussions with Google and Microsoft from the technology side; but this is a broader question.

Dr. Smith suggested the Agency talk to text publishers who are looking at the change from print to other forms of interaction with the university world.

Mr. Flynn replied that the fundamental question is how does EPA work to better present and be a player in helping provide environmental information.

Venture Capital Study

Dr. Watts stated that the Environmental Technology Subcommittee is going to look into the world of venture capital. How do you get the money to get the great ideas that have

been to some degree demonstrated into the marketplace? Venture capital is one approach. If EPA is interested in identifying and moving potentially valuable environmental technology to the marketplace, maybe there are things EPA can do. It's suggested a subset of the Environmental Technology Subcommittee prepare a letter report about what EPA could do. If there are others on this Council who have a background and interest in this, let us know. We just need assurance from the Council to move forward with this effort.

Mr. Meyers suggested the Environmental Financial Advisory Board (EFAB) be a part of the effort.

Mr. Struhs replied that EPA should not be in a position of directing private capital, but you can create the environment where you attract it. One thing to be discussed is the leverage EPA has to provide regulatory relief for those who take the risk of installing new, innovative technology. It's not about lowering standards, it's about creating coverage for the company willing to put their own money on the line and make the bet. And if it doesn't work, there's not some enforcement consequence as a result. It would be a great way of unlocking some private capital.

Dr. Watts stated that the Council needs to hear about what holds people back from making investments so we can consider what are the things that cause hesitation in making investments that EPA has some control over.

Dr. Lambert suggested ORD host a workshop with a group of venture capitalists. He also suggested that patent and licensing is a critical component of venture capital and needs to be included.

Public Comments

Mr. Patterson, Director of Economics and Finance Consulting for Ecoenergy, began by stating he would encourage the venture capital study, but also include in the workshop private equity and debt lenders. The kinds of projects EPA is involved in lend themselves to a broader span of capital than just venture capital.

Mr. Wise concurred with the comments just made and suggested the possibility for cross-collaboration with EFAB on this project. There are a variety of capital sources that operate to promote technology, not the least of which is public capital. State revolving loan funds provide capital for construction of wastewater treatment works. In many cases it's advanced technology. Also, be aware that deep within EPA's regulatory structure are a variety of barriers to the deployment of new capital, so regulatory reform may be required.

Ms. O'Donnell suggested finding a half hour tomorrow to talk about the work production issue she raised earlier. The NACEPT members and meeting attendees then broke for lunch and spent the afternoon in workgroup sessions.

Friday, November 9, 2007

Discussion of NACEPT Report Process

Mr. Howard introduced a discussion of how the NACEPT process can be improved. Currently, the Council produces big reports that take 2 years and advice letters that take a month and a half. Though there is general guidance from FACA and OCEM, he believes there should be some discussion among them regarding improving the efficiency of their internal process. The next 15 minutes of Council time will be devoted to process improvement, opening with Ms. O'Donnell's comments.

Ms. O'Donnell has been on the Council for 2 ½ years and has contributed to 3 reports. She sees the need to improve the procedures to make the most efficient use of Council members' time, EPA's time, and contractor time. She would like to hear other Council members' thoughts about that, and suggests that consistency in work models for the working groups would improve Council efficiency. She defers to members of the Stewardship workgroup to outline for the Council the working model they used.

She gave an overview of the 3 workgroups in which she has participated: 1) the Water Infrastructure Phase 1 workgroup (no contractor), whose process she considered the most inefficient, in that each member wrote up a draft and 3 iterations of a section of the work, then one member—Dr. Watts—was tasked with pulling together all of those for the final product; 2) the Report on the Environment work group (no contractor), a short-timeframe report, for which the workgroup members were asked to review and comment on an 40 page executive summary report and then refine their collective input, at which point people drifted off. She would have preferred that their raw commentary be handed off to someone to be refined into a rough draft; and 3) the Water Infrastructure Phase 2 workgroup (with EPA support and a contractor) for which the roles are unclear.

Mr. Meyers had not considered the Environmental Stewardship Workgroup particularly efficient, but the process had been terrific. The group members took turns producing content. Ms. Nash did a lot of work integrating different parts, and they now have a great person on contract taking all those final drafts to the level of a final product.

Ms. Nash is pleased that their process should be considered as a model for work group procedures, but notes that the group first had 1 ½ years of discussion on what it should do before she organized a rough outline of 4 bullet points for fleshing out by the group at their April meeting, where the members volunteered to take responsibility for the different sections of the final outline. The group next pulled the individual sections together, and EPA reviewed the draft and asked that it be narrowed down to 5 key recommendations. The writers of each section then created a key recommendation for it, and, on the basis of the 5 key recommendations, the entire report was rewritten.

Mr. Meyers agrees that until the April meeting they had been in a less focused discussion phase, and that the work really moved forward when the overall topic was divided into sections and those became the specific assignments of individual volunteers.

Ms. O'Donnell stated that what happened in the Stewardship group's process is typical: discuss the issue, outline, give tasks, write sections, but then there is a drop off in level of interest and participation after the first draft. Once the draft is 80% or more complete, she feels that it should be handed off to someone to do the final refining and integrating of the sections at that point, so that members have an opportunity to step back and take a look at how the whole thing hangs together and how to sharpen the thrust of the recommendations, rather than doing a lot of iterations getting to the final draft. The point of contact with the EPA and the hand-off to someone for refinement should be consciously planned from the inception of the group's work.

Mr. Meyers stated that Derry Allen and Sonia Altieri contributed to the work group by helping to sharpen the discussion from their experience and by asking provocative questions and providing some guidance with suggestions about effective ways to handle the issues, without EPA interference in the Council's decisions.

Ms. Altieri agreed that contractor support is ideal in the beginning stages. Fortunately, we were able to secure resources directed to the Stewardship Workgroup.

Mr. Howard asked Ms. O'Donnell if written guidelines would help. For the immediate future, Ms. O'Donnell feels that this sharing of how the process has worked in some ways for the groups will facilitate each group's planning so they don't get too far down the road towards a final report before they realize they have a problem and need guidance. For the long run, a written procedural model of how the Council members think their products can be produced most efficiently would be helpful to obviate each group reinventing the wheel. She notes that the resources are not always available for that help, and that the importance of planning may be greater or lesser for larger and smaller reports, but that we should learn from our past experience and try to document this.

Mr. Howard agrees, and notes that there is also some work within EPA looking at processes across the different advisory committees.

Dr. Watts agrees with Ms. O'Donnell and Mr. Howard and observes that the cautionary corollary is that the group be mindful in taking on new work so as not to over commit and not be able to deliver a useful product.

Mr. Howard agrees, and notes that the better the products, the more the groups are then expected to take on, and resources are of course limited within the Council, as well as within EPA for providing the help that is needed. He ends the discussion with a plan to work with Sonia Altieri, Megan Moreau, Mark Joyce, and Rafael DeLeon on process guidelines and to report back on that discussion.

Workgroup Report-Outs

Energy and Environment Workgroup

Mr. Olson reports that he and Mr. Stewart incorporated the comments on the draft advice letter to include the tribal dimension, projecting impacts, the distance between the components of the biofuels infrastructure, environmental justice, and the relationship to existing industries.

Dr. Hecht said the workgroup is considering a 4th advice letter about the issue of sustainability, as they feel that most discussions of that issue aren't as sophisticated as they need to be. To that end, the group invited several speakers to present to them on those concerns. Bill Chism and David Widawsky of EPA presented their work on sustainability, and Darlene Schuster did a presentation from the American Institute of Chemical Engineers, which has an Institute of Sustainability. The group was impressed with the scope of what that institute has done—an enormous effort toward coming up with ways that their member companies can assess the sustainability of their corporate operations using a set of questions developed by the institute. The group also heard from Ernest Shea, Project Coordinator of the 25-by-25 Workgroup about their approach to sustainability in a process related to renewable energy and biofuels, but also with interesting political participation from both the left and the right.

Cindy Riley from NREL presented a framework she developed and group members discussed the stages of information gathering and analysis that must precede consideration of real sustainability. The Energy Workgroup has not yet decided whether they will develop another advice letter from this information, but a subgroup consisting of Dr. Cruse, Mr. Olson, Ms. Perla and Mr. Manty will work with Ms. Riley to consider using her framework and the technique developed by the American Institute of Chemical Engineers of posing questions to assess levels of contributions to sustainability at the different levels of the biofuels supply chain. They will probably pass that on in an unrefined form to the EPA to use in the development of its internal biofuels strategy. Dr. Hecht also brought up the idea of the group making a contribution on international issues involved in biofuels, but the Energy Workgroup has not had time to discuss that. A letter on operational aspects of sustainability may be their final contribution to the energy report. Ms. Altieri notes that the final advice letter or draft to EPA would need first to be agreed on by the workgroup. Once there is approval, it would be forwarded to the full Council for approval. Workgroup and subcommittee reports/advice letters must be reviewed and approved by the full Council before submitting it to the EPA.

Sustainable Water Infrastructure Workgroup

The Water Workgroup is still discussing their approach to Phase II of the charge. Basically, they are looking at how the water, wastewater, and storm water utilities can become or remain sustainable financially over the long term, and how that impacts public health, water supply, and other services, and also looking at mechanisms to reduce costs,

gain efficiencies, and improve the environment, and how all three of those efforts work together.

The group will focus on the following three areas:

- 1) What EPA can do to break down barriers, assist and/or encourage utilities to consider regional, collaborative, and sustainable solutions (for which they have found the report from yesterday's NACEPT meeting *Everyone's Business: Working Towards Sustainability Through Environmental Stewardship and Collaboration* a perfect resource);
- 2) How to develop public education and outreach efforts and to take the variety of tools the EPA already has for water utility companies to promote sustainable practices within their water operations and figure out how to communicate those and get them integrated into utility thinking (employing the same report for its ideas on information access strategy to be used outside the watershed/water industry basis); and
- 3) What EPA can do to encourage regional water planning among the states and political subdivisions (e.g., looking at the SRF Grant Fund Program and others to encourage some kind of collaborative effort to fund water sustainability and motivate the regions to go a little bit further and really study the water issue in a holistic way).

The workgroup will meet again in the second or third week of February to work on a draft report they hope to bring back to NACEPT in May, followed by a final report in June.

Environmental Stewardship/Cooperative Workgroup

In response to the Council's recommendation, Mr. Meyers has culled two key recommendations from the report to include in the transmittal letter: 1) EPA should reframe its mission with stewardship as the unifying theme and ethic, and 2) EPA should strive to become the world's premier stewardship model and catalyst. Those now precede the former opening statements concerning the definition of stewardship, which have been retained in paragraph 3. They have added that fully embracing stewardship will not always be easy for the Agency, but it is the best way to ensure future prosperity.

They have addressed the Council's concern that the original text of the letter and report gave too facile an outlook on the process that the EPA will be expected to employ to achieve the stewardship goals, by adding the following: *Implementing the full scope of the recommendations will require continuing EPA management attention and a long-term sustained investment. Paradigm shifts take time and patience as well as strategic implementation. EPA's successful implementation of pollution prevention illustrates how this can be accomplished.*

They also added a reference to the National Environmental Policy Act of 1970 as an underlying authority to implement the recommendations, and a statement reminding EPA of the timeliness of a move in the direction of stewardship.

The workgroup is proposing to brief the Administrator and to participate in regional and program office dialogues to initiate discussions around the environmental stewardship recommendations in the report. The EPA representatives that were present during the workgroup's discussion yesterday were supportive of the idea.

Despite the Council's suggestion to reduce the number of proposed action steps, the workgroup decided to keep them intact. Each step was connected to all of the others, so the group was hard-pressed to decide which one was more important than the other, and they did not consider the number of steps overwhelming. In addition to underscoring in the report the same key recommendations they highlighted in the transmittal letter, the group made the comment up front clarifying that EPA has the relevant statutory authority and added specific end-note references to that effect, as well. A General Counsel's memorandum has also been written that identifies additional authorities, and that will now be in the end notes to the report.

They declined to highlight among the voluntary standards programs specifically the one represented in ISO 14001 until EPA Headquarters subscribes to that program. They also learned today through their discussions that there have been some 32 facilities that are fully conforming to the international management standards, so, in fact, that work appears to have been done. They considered the area of punishment and rewards and added an additional line and an immediate step #4.1 that recommends that the agency look at a strategy for recognizing environmental stewardship champions, which step they punted over to the Office of Human Resources to be addressed there, but found the consideration of punishment to be difficult for them to address, electing to promote instead the establishment of incentives, and declining the role of giving negative enforcement counsel.

Ms. Nash observed that the group had a very productive discussion today with EPA staff: Chuck Kent, Bob Benson and Donna Fletcher (in person), and Melissa McCullough, Steve Perkins, Cathy Hunt, Howard Wilson, Linda Rimer, and Steve Sutton (by phone). What came through most clearly from the EPA staff is that people in the Agency want to know what the Council's recommendations mean for how they do their jobs and how to integrate those with what they do every day; they want to be shown specifically what is different from already implemented practice, and how they might go about measuring whether they are implementing these recommendations and moving in the direction of stewardship and cooperative conservation. That input is what motivated the extra paragraph in the transmittal letter, the suggestion that they go out and listen to what people in the program offices and the regions are telling the council about how stewardship is reflected currently in their jobs and what are their ideas for how to go about embracing this concept more fully. The Stewardship Workgroup thinks that type of listening approach is very consistent with one of the report themes—collaborative governance—toward making these concepts real.

Ms. Perla noted that there is overlap among the workgroups and requested that the Council take time, as a workgroup is concluding its report, to raise any issues from the other groups that may be relevant. Mr. Howard and Mr. Meyers observed that much has

been accomplished in that respect in the past year. Ms. Perla suggested that some of the tools the biofuels group has been working with may be useful in moving the Stewardship dialogue forward.

The Council approved the Stewardship report and Mr. Howard thanked the workgroup members for 2 plus years of work.

Update on the 20th Anniversary of NACEPT

Ms. Altieri discussed the upcoming 20th anniversary of NACEPT. Prior to 2000, the Council meetings were basically report-outs from the subcommittees and Council approval of subcommittee reports. Since 2000, there has been a change in the fact that NACEPT had begun to take on its own projects and has reorganized into workgroups. Currently, NACEPT is organized into four workgroups: 1) water, 2) energy, 3) environmental stewardship, and 4) environmental indicators.

To mark the 10-year anniversary, the Council undertook a study to evaluate its past performance and its impact on the agency, and also to chart a course for the future in terms of how to identify ways to better serve EPA and promote efficiency in the operations of the Council itself. In those 10-year anniversary's preparations, the Council appointed a Steering Committee consisting of some former members, current members, and EPA employees. Some of the key questions that they asked during that time were:

- 1) What happened to NACEPT's advice over the last 10 years?
- 2) What has been the impact on policies, regulations, etc.?
- 3) How many reports and recommendations were formulated?
- 4) How will this help us with the direction in the future?
- 5) How can NACEPT be more effective?

The key findings showed that NACEPT had made a significant impact on the Agency over the first 10 years. Another key finding was that the membership is balanced and representative of various points of view.

EPA staff is thinking about doing a study similar to the 10-year report, which would evaluate the impact of NACEPT's recommendations. Ms. Altieri believes a report on the current and future status of the Council would position the committee well.

She outlined the following ideas for consideration: case studies from the committee over the years; interviews with EPA senior leadership (current and former Administrators, Deputy Administrators, and Assistant Administrators); a steering committee similar to that of the first study; an internal EPA group's assistance with ideas; and contractor support. For the actual anniversary date, there could be a panel of senior leaders to tell about their experience with NACEPT, and possibly a discussion on what topics NACEPT should take up in the future. She welcomes ideas from the Council members

Mr. Howard suggested a task force to pull together all the ideas. The 3 major components he sees as comprising the anniversary commemoration effort are: 1) a reception; 2) a report on what NACEPT has accomplished over the past 20 years; 3) panels to discuss the future direction of NACEPT, and who should be on the panels: congressional folks, think-tank folks, trade associations?

Ms. Green stated that she has a strong belief in the importance of periodic review of programs and processes, and has implemented regular external review of programs and procedures every 5 years for all the programs that report to her. She believes that in terms of the council's organizing a review of its programs/process, there should also be some benchmarking component used to compare NACEPT's operations with those of other like organizations outside the federal government system. She would like to see the 20th anniversary commemoration as a very forward-thinking event, built upon the themes of stewardship and sustainability, incorporating the prospective ideas that are beginning to coalesce within the council and giving them a much larger forum besides just the administrator and the staff. She hopes that NACEPT will really make those themes the center of a very thoughtful symposium.

Mr. Laskowski stated that for the sake of objectivity, he believes that it is very important to have the review done by a group external to the Council. He has noticed also that if the reviewers are from inside the Beltway the review begins to take on the Beltway values and point of view, so he would suggest employing a group that are critical in nature and from outside the Beltway. He thinks it would be good to have a group speak at the anniversary symposium about the EPA's future issues and plans, in order to lay the groundwork for how NACEPT can support those.

Dr. Smith said that he agrees that this is an opportunity for which the timing could not be better in terms of coming out with where NACEPT sees the agency going forward, and with the idea of building on the whole issue of stewardship.

Mr. Holmberg suggested using UN Foundation assistance because they might be well-equipped to do this.

Mr. Manty suggested involving other EPA advisory boards in review. It might be particularly helpful to look across the structure of advisory councils that serve EPA and contribute the science for which NACEPT considers policy implications and plans for implementation.

Mr. Olson suggested a panel on climate change in next decade.

Mr. Howard stated that the Council needs to consider what and whom EPA wants for the event. Some of the planning for the 20th anniversary event themes will depend on what the EPA wants presented, but perhaps there could be involvement of former Administrators if they were interested or deputies, people from outside the NACEPT world, and maybe some people who aren't even in the environmental world.

Mr. Meyers stated it would be useful to have a NACEPT person speaking as well as someone from the Agency to talk about the value of the particular product and why it was helpful. He agrees with Ms. Green that benchmark comparisons with other like organizations can provide a more balanced review of NACEPT's work over the last decade.

Dr. Watts noted the amorphous nature of NACEPT's mandate allows the Council a great deal of flexibility as an advisory group not enjoyed by the other advisory boards, whose mission is much more narrowly focused. However, he notes that such narrow focus also makes it easier for the other boards to monitor and evaluate the results of their advice. He suggests including as a component of the 20th anniversary review an evaluation of how productively EPA has made use of NACEPT's advice regarding environmental policy and technology.

Mr. Howard considers it a good idea for NACEPT to review what kind of techniques best promoted EPA implementation of its advice, in order to avoid a situation where their work product just sits on the shelf at the agency.

Mr. Manty suggested the National Academy may be able to do the review. If their charge is broad enough to include reviewing the NACEPT history, the National Academy of Public Administration might be a possibility.

Mr. DeLeon and Ms. Altieri thanked everyone for their input regarding celebrating past accomplishments, assessing the process, or looking toward charting a future course.

Wrap Up and Next Steps

- Council members should let Sonia know if they are interested in helping with the 20th anniversary event. Ms. Altieri asks that anyone interested in working on the anniversary process send her any ideas they have not already shared today.
- The Report on the Environment teleconference will be scheduled in the near future.
- For planning purposes, the Water and Energy workgroups need to identify dates and locations for the workgroup meetings as soon as possible.
- Members of the Environmental Stewardship workgroup need to think about where they would like to participate. Currently, there are 2 workgroups still extant—Energy and Water, a new project on information access on the horizon, and also possibly one on partnerships.
- The 2008 NACEPT meetings have tentatively been scheduled for May 14-15 and November 13-14, depending on meeting space availability. Both meetings will be held in Washington, DC.

Public Comments

There were no public comments and the meeting adjourned.

ATTACHMENT 1

List of Participants

NACEPT Members

John L. Howard, Jr., Chair
Joel Bolstein
Jeffory Crane
Richard Cruse
Carolyn Green
Robert Gruenig
William Holmberg (11/9)
Stan Laskowski
Erik Meyers
William Mullican
Jennifer Nash (11/9)
Howard Neukrug
Arleen O'Donnell
Robert L. Olson
Brad Smith
Frank Stewart
David Struhs
Daniel Watts

NACEPT Workgroup Members

Suzanne Goss (JEA)
George Lambert (Science Advisory Board)
Cynthia Riley (NREL)
John Wise (EFAB)

Designated Federal Officer

Sonia Altieri

EPA Representatives

Derry Allen
William Brandes
Geraldine Brown
Oscar Carrillo
Andy Crossland
Rafael DeLeon
Donna Fletcher

Mike Flynn
Larry Gonzalez
Brenda Groskinsky
Alan Hecht
Khanna Johnston
Mark Joyce
Dan Kaiser
Robert Larson
Dale Manty
Ethan McMahon
Megan Moreau
Donna Perla
Jon Scholl
Peter Shanaghan
Paul Shapiro
Dave Solan
David Widawsky

Guest Presenters and Members of the Public

Beverly Campbell (Scientific Consulting Group)
John Cromwell (Stratus Consulting)
Jonathan Gaither (GWU)
Andrew Grimes (GWU)
Phil Helgersen (NACEPT Environmental Technology Subcommittee)
Gil Jackson (USAid/DOE)
Jeff Kinney (BNA)
Andrew Paterson (EcoEnergy)
Darlene Schuster (AIChE)
Dain Roose-Snyder (Edenspace Systems)
Todd Wiggins (Urban Revival Media)

Contractor Support-Beta

Debra Derr